İ	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
2	WESTERN DIVISION
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : CASE NO. 1:18-cr-0043
4	Plaintiff, : STATUS VIDEOCONFERENCE
5	:
6	YANJUN XU, also known as XU : YANJUN, also known as QU HUI, : 30th of September, 2021 also known as ZHANG HUI, : 12:00 P.M.
7	:
8	Defendant. :
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY S. BLACK, JUDGE
10	A DDDA DA MODO
11	APPEARANCES: For the Plaintiff:
12	Timothy S. Mangan, Esq. Emily N. Glatfelter, Esq.
13	Assistant United States Attorneys 221 East Fourth Street, Suite 400
14	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
15	For the Defendant: Ralph William Kohnen, Esq.
16	Jeanne Marie Cors, Esq. Taft Stettinius and Hollister
17	425 East Walnut Street, Suite 1800 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 and
18	Florian Miedel, Esq. Miedel & Mysliwiec, LLP
19	80 Broad Street, Suite 1900 New York, New York 10004
20	
21	Also present: May Harding, Interpreter Yanjun Xu, Defendant
22	Law Clerk: Cristina V. Frankian, Esq.
23	Courtroom Deputy: Rebecca Santoro
24	Stenographer: Lisa Conley Yungblut, RDR, RMR, CRR, CRC United States District Court
25	100 East Fifth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

```
1
        (Proceedings held by videoconference at 12:00 p.m.)
 2
                THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is United States
 3
       District Court Judge Timothy Black on the record appearing
      by videoconference as if in the open courtroom. We're here
 4
 5
       on the criminal docket in the case of United States versus
       Xu, 1:18-cr-43. We're here for a status conference
 6
7
       specifically relating to upcoming jury selection.
 8
                I'd like to begin by identifying the participants
 9
       in this conference. Who appear as the attorneys for the
10
      United States of America?
                MR. MANGAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Tim
11
12
      Mangan and Emily Glatfelter for the government.
                THE COURT: Good afternoon to the two of you. I
13
14
       can see you on the videoconference and I heard you, Mr.
15
      Mangan.
16
                Who appear as the attorneys for Mr. Xu?
17
      Mr. Kohnen, are you threatening -- there you go.
18
                MR. KOHNEN: Sorry about that. I'm here on behalf
19
       of Mr. Xu, so is my colleague, Florian Miedel, who's also on
20
       the screen. Jeanne Cors is there with Mr. Xu. And present
       also is May Harding, our interpreter.
21
22
                THE COURT: Good afternoon to all of you. And I
23
       can see Mr. Miedel. I see you, Mr. Kohnen. I see Ms. Cors
24
       in the presence of Mr. Xu.
25
                And, Mr. Xu, good afternoon. I'm Judge Black.
```

1 you hear me? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Very well. Good afternoon. 4 And we have an interpreter present. Ma'am, if 5 you'd be willing to take an oath to accurately translate the 6 language. Your right hand is up, mine is as well. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will 7 8 accurately translate these proceedings under the penalties 9 of perjury? 10 THE INTERPRETER: Yes, I will. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. You may lower your right 12 hand. And on behalf of the Court and the community, thank 13 you for the work you are doing. 14 Also engaged in this conference is Cristina 15 Frankian, who's my career law clerk, she's a lawyer, works 16 for me; also Rebecca Santoro, who's the courtroom deputy and 17 my assistant. The US Marshal, John, is linked to the 18 conference as well. The court reporter is Lisa Conley 19 Yungblut, whom the Court is grateful for her presence and 20 continuing work. 21 Let me make a short statement and then we'll hear 22 from each side in turn. We're scheduled to go to jury trial 23 beginning October 18th running potentially up until 24 December 1st with time off for Thanksgiving. Due to the 25 length of the anticipated trial as well as the issues

1 presented in this case, which pose a particular risk of 2 bias, particularly under the current circumstances, the 3 Court anticipates having a difficult time finding jurors who are ready, willing, and able to serve. To ensure a larger 4 5 pool, the Court called 350 prospective jurors, and of those, 6 175 prospective jurors responded. 7 Let me pause and ask the interpreter whether you 8 are able to keep up with me and whether Mr. Xu can tell me 9 that he understands what I'm saying? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Very well. And the interpreter, ma'am, 11 12 you're able to keep up with me; is that right? 13 THE INTERPRETER: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Thank you for your work. 15 All right. So we called for 350 prospective 16 We've gotten 175 that have responded. 17 Additionally, there are currently three jury trials, 18 including our own, scheduled to begin in Cincinnati on 19 October 18, 2021. Therefore, those 175 jurors need to be 20 divided between the three trials. Typically, the jury 21 coordinator would wait until the morning of voir dire, first 22 day of trial, and after every prospective juror arrives 23 would simply assign the jurors to a trial evenly. For 24 instance, the first 50 would go to our trial, the next 50 25 would go to Judge Dlott's trial, the next 50 would go to

Judge McFarland's trial.

But, again, our trial has a higher likelihood of needing to excuse jurors for hardships or cause, based largely upon length and the subject matter. Therefore, if we do not work to identify viable jurors for our trial in advance, we could ultimately be assigned 50 prospective jurors most of whom will get excused due to hardships, availability, bias, thereby, leaving us with too few jurors to proceed. We would then have to call a new pool and start jury selection over; whereas, there may have been jurors present that day who could have served on our jury if they had only been in our group.

In an effort to pre-identify viable jurors, the Court sent out a supplemental questionnaire which both sides reviewed and approved. Now the Court must create a procedure that will hopefully alleviate the concerns I've just raised. Excuse me. And our proposal is for the Court, the judge, to review the questionnaires first and to, quote, pre-exclude, end quote, the jurors who would have inevitably been excused had they appeared in our courtroom for voir dire the morning of trial. Those jurors that we would pre-excuse would then go to one of the other two trials, thereby, leaving us with a pool of jurors who we know are ready, willing, and able to serve the entirety of the trial free of bias or prejudice.

But before we proceed in that way, I want to be certain that both sides are comfortable with the proposal. If both parties unanimously agree that the Court can pre-exclude those individuals with hardships, then, we'll proceed accordingly.

What I want to avoid is a situation where all agree to this process and then down the road to have either side -- excuse me -- argue that the Court pre-excluded a prospective juror that they would have wanted had they only known about him or her. I don't think it's fair to allow the parties to hand-pick their jury pool in advance, which is why my proposal is to allow me to exercise my discretion as reflected in law in a fair and neutral manner just as I would have done if the jurors had appeared in person for voir dire.

What we're trying to avoid is getting assigned 50 prospective jurors of -- a large number of which we already know are unavailable or ought to be excused perhaps, for example, in bias. The individuals who would be unavailable for our weeks-long trial could well be available for the other two trials, and they should be diverted there before the morning of voir dire.

The proposed categories of exclusion that I would exercise with your consent is, No. 1, unavailability. If they have got a prescheduled vacation, a doctor's procedure,

whatever, if they are indicating they're not available for the entirety of our trial, we have to excuse them now and not have unavailable people in our pool. Unavailability is related to work and financial hardship. It's related to medical concerns.

And then the absolute proposed category of exclusion would include non-mask-wearers who indicate they're unwilling to wear a mask given the pandemic, which would be in violation of the Court rules and would be a basis to exclude them.

I'd like to talk subsequently about how we deal with bias. If we have an indication that a juror says they can't trust anybody from -- who doesn't share their Judeo-Christian values or who comes from China, I think we ought to address that beforehand, but you may want to address it during voir dire. What we're trying to do is build a pool that gets assigned to us which is people who can serve unless excused by the parties pursuant to preemptory challenges or for cause.

So having said all of that, I want to go around the table and understand what your reaction is, if you have questions or comments, and I'll do it one side at a time.

And my career law clerk, Ms. Frankian, may well be called upon to respond to any of your comments along with me.

So with that, which of the attorneys for the United

States can be responsive to what the Court is presenting now?

MR. MANGAN: Your Honor, this is Tim Mangan. I'll speak on behalf of the government.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. MANGAN: Your Honor, we certainly understand the difficulty that we've got here based on all of the factors that you've just laid out and the situation upcoming. With respect to what the Court has laid out, we would be agreeable. We have no problem with the unavailability issue that the Court walked through, that the Court would then look at the questionnaires, as I understand it, and sort of in the normal course look at those who simply cannot serve for that long a time for all of the various reasons that you identified. And we understand the reason why you want to try to do that without us being the parties preselecting the jury pool.

The second category that you mentioned were those who would be refusing to wear masks in accordance with Judge Marbley's order. Given that what they're indicating would violate the Southern District of Ohio order, we certainly understand why and think the Court would have discretion to handle those jurors separately.

Our proposal would be at that point to kind of see where we are as far as the numbers, because when it gets to

sort of that next step of cause and talking about individuals with bias, I know traditionally in normal selection, that's one where at least the parties would be able to see the questionnaires at that time and sometimes ask questions. I realize that some questions -- some answers on the questionnaire may seem very, very clear, but we've all seen with some jury selections where there's a back-and-forth about certain individuals.

So I guess our proposal, Your Honor, in response to what you laid out is we would be agreeable to the process certainly as to those first two categories, the unavailability and the refusal to follow the mask order for the district. We would suggest at that point seeing where we are as far as numbers for the pool, and if there's still a problem and you think we need to go to that next step, you know, in terms of screening bias or -- can we wait and do that during the normal voir dire?

Or is there a way to -- another option would be at that point maybe the parties could see the questionnaires that are at issue and we could at least discuss those potential bias issues, you know, in an adversarial -- or, you know, in the normal court hearing like this, but with us having the benefit of at least knowing what we're talking about from the questionnaire. So that's our initial feedback, Your Honor.

```
1
                THE COURT: And that's entirely responsive and
2
       professional, and the Court expresses its appreciation for
 3
       that approach.
                Ms. Glatfelter, has Mr. Mangan spoken
 4
 5
       comprehensively or would you like to supplement?
 6
                MS. GLATFELTER: No, I agree with everything said.
7
       Thank you.
 8
                THE COURT: Very well. Who'll be heard on behalf
 9
       of the defendant?
10
                MR. KOHNEN: Your Honor, this is Ralph Kohnen.
11
       I'll be happy to speak on behalf of Mr. Xu. But I would
12
       also ask the Court since my colleague, Jeanne Cors, is there
13
       in the jail with him and the translator, that she be given
14
       an opportunity, No. 1, to make sure that he understands
15
       what's been said so far; and, secondly, that after I speak
       what will of course be my opinion, he concurs and it then
16
17
       becomes our opinion, with the Court's permission.
18
                THE COURT: That's absolutely appropriate and
19
       granted. Let me at this stage ask Ms. Cors and Mr. Xu and
20
       the translator whether you've heard everything I said and
21
       you've also heard everything the government has said?
22
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
                THE INTERPRETER: Yes.
24
                THE COURT: That right, Ms. Cors?
25
                MS. CORS: Yes, Your Honor.
```

1 THE COURT: Very well. So, Mr. Kohnen, I would 2 propose that you give us the Defendant Xu's reaction at this 3 stage, and we'll confirm it with Ms. Cors and your client. 4 MR. KOHNEN: Okay. Thank you, Judge. For 5 background, Ms. Frankian gave us a heads-up on this, as I'm 6 sure she did with other counsel, so we've had an opportunity 7 to discuss it among the attorneys. And I think that the 8 Court's suggestion along with, I guess I'll call it, Mr. 9 Mangan's next step is a good one. It's one that we came up 10 with as well. You know, I think it's worth everybody reminding themselves that this is a process that is pretty 11 12 much undertaken by the Courts before trials independent of 13 counsel's involvement, especially with things such as 14 unavailability and what I guess would be fairly unique 15 circumstances. 16 Because of that and for a lot of other reasons, we 17 have no problem with the Court making that -- let's call it 18 the first cut of Category 1, the unavailability, 19 non-mask-wearers, and would probably expand a little bit and 20 say that there are probably other more obvious reasons that 21 we absolutely trust the Court to excuse potential jurors 22 for. 23 Jeanne, you want to make sure Xu's okay with that 24 so far? 25 MS. CORS: Yes. I've spoken with Mr. Xu and he is

1 amenable to that as well. 2 THE COURT: Is that right, Mr. Xu? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 MR. KOHNEN: Judge, we also, as I mentioned, like 6 the idea about how that the folks that could be revealed as biased could at least be screened, I guess is a good way to 7 8 put it. In addition to the questionnaires, I think we would 9 ask that the Court take it upon itself to share with us any 10 other information that might come in about these individual 11 prospective jurors. Again, speaking from experience, that 12 they call the clerk's office sometimes, they get through to 13 chambers on occasion, any communication like that in 14 addition to the juror questionnaires would be appreciated. 15 I think the Court is envisioning, and I think I heard Mr. 16 Mangan say, that we would sort of reconstitute once that 17 second -- I'll call it the second cut is done and discuss 18 where we go from here. 19 For the record and also as a product of our 20 conversation among the attorneys, we, of course, recognize 21 that no matter how we do it, it's ultimately up to the man 22 in the black robe. So we appreciate the accommodations 23 here. 24 THE COURT: Thank you. That's entirely responsive. 25 I think what I heard was that the parties are willing to

1 acquiesce to what the Court has the authority and discretion 2 to do, and that is to excuse people for unavailability and 3 for unwillingness to abide by a court order to wear a mask. 4 After we've done that, we would then regroup, find out where 5 we are in terms of numbers, and then collectively begin to 6 determine how to proceed to evaluate bias, either pre voir dire or at voir dire. Is that what you were saying, 7 8 Mr. Kohnen? 9 MR. KOHNEN: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: And is that the government's 11 perspective, Mr. Mangan? 12 MR. MANGAN: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Cors, is there anything from your 14 end that we need to touch base with yet? We're not done, 15 but I saw you standing. 16 MS. CORS: No, Your Honor. I'm just making sure we 17 mute and unmute so you can't hear the interpreter. 18 THE COURT: After that experience, will you work 19 with Mr. Kohnen, please? Very well. 20 Ms. Frankian, I'm on the record. You have been 21 extraordinary in driving this attempt to be efficient, 22 totally transparent, fair and impartial. Is there anything 23 that the government has said you want to respond to or 24 clarify? Is there anything the defense has said that you 25 would like to inquire of, respond to, or clarify?

1 MS. FRANKIAN: No, Judge. So we would pre-excuse 2 the unavailable prospective jurors and those with financial 3 hardships, physical concerns, non-mask-wearers. And then should -- should I separate out those individuals who 4 5 have -- who the Court is inclined to excuse for bias so that 6 everyone can weigh in on those individuals separately or should I just send everyone remaining? 7 8 THE COURT: My understanding is you were going to 9 identify the potential biased prospective jurors, and we 10 would talk through those questionnaires and those alone with 11 the lawyers, and then we would confer as to whether there's 12 a consensus that allegedly biased Juror Nos. 7 and 12 should 13 be pre-excused. 14 Is that your understanding of the approach we are 15 developing, Mr. Mangan? 16 MR. MANGAN: Yes, that would be fine with us, Your 17 Honor. 18 THE COURT: And is that acceptable to the defense, 19 Mr. Kohnen? 20 MR. KOHNEN: Yes, it is, Your Honor. Of course, we 21 would be grateful to get the questionnaires of the venire 22 panel as soon as possible, but we're fine with the way it 23 was stated. 24 THE COURT: Fair enough. 25 Is that responsive to your inquiry, Ms. Frankian,

```
1
       or do you have additional follow-up?
 2
                MS. FRANKIAN: I think that's responsive.
 3
                THE COURT: Very well, I agree. And all of the
       lawyers, even the judge, appreciate the enormous work
 4
 5
       Ms. Frankian does for the Court day after day after day. So
 6
       that is the way in which we will proceed.
7
                I need to ask directly on the record if the Court
 8
       proceeds in the way that we just amicably came to an agreed
 9
       approach, no complaint, no appeal of that portion of the
10
       voir dire selection process; is that right from the
11
       government's perspective, Mr. Mangan?
12
                MR. MANGAN: It is, Your Honor, yes.
13
                THE COURT: Is that right, Mr. Kohnen, from the
14
       defendant's perspective?
15
                You're muted. You're muted. Mr. Kohnen, you're
16
       muted.
17
                MR. KOHNEN: Sorry, Judge. My software does it
18
       automatically.
19
                I'll promise you that none of the lawyers who are
20
       involved in this case before the trial court will appeal.
21
                THE COURT: On this issue.
22
                MR. KOHNEN: Of course, on this issue. And I would
23
       like Ms. Cors to make sure that our client understands that.
24
                THE COURT: Very well. Ms. Cors, can you confer
25
       with Mr. Xu -- you don't have to speak in my presence -- and
```

```
1
       then advise me?
 2
                MS. CORS: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
                THE COURT: So have you asked Mr. Xu, if we proceed
 4
       in this way, he understands there's no complaining about it
 5
       or appealing about it later?
 6
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
7
                MS. CORS: Yes, we have conferred with him, and he
 8
       is amenable to that.
 9
                THE COURT: I also heard him say "yes."
10
                So I think we have accomplished in large part what
11
       we had intended today. It's always nice to see you, Mr.
12
       Miedel.
13
                MR. MIEDEL: Thank you. You too.
14
                THE COURT: Very well. Is there more we need to
15
       discuss today from the government's perspective? We'll be
16
       chatting regularly going forward.
17
                MR. MANGAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you very much.
18
                THE COURT: Anything further from the defendant's
       perspective, Mr. Kohnen?
19
20
                MR. KOHNEN: No, Your Honor. I hope you can hear
21
           Thank you to the Court and to Ms. Frankian.
22
                THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kohnen. That's a credit
23
       to you.
24
                Anything further from your end, Ms. Cors, from Mr.
25
       Xu's perspective today at this time?
```

1 MS. CORS: No, Your Honor, other than to thank the 2 Court for organizing the conference here. Chambers was very 3 helpful in facilitating the logistics. THE COURT: Very well. Glad to hear that. It 4 5 doesn't surprise me. 6 Ms. Frankian, is there more we should proceed today 7 or are we prepared to adjourn this? 8 MS. FRANKIAN: Nothing further, Judge. 9 THE COURT: Very well. I want to thank you all for 10 participating timely. I want you to know that I want you to 11 stay safe and do well. Thank you for calling in timely. 12 I'm going to end the hearing now by saying goodbye and 13 leaving the meeting. Thank you all. 14 (Proceedings concluded at 12:26 p.m.) 15 CERTIFICATE 16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter 17 prepared from my stenotype notes. /s/ Lisa Conley Yungblut 18 10/12/2021 LISA CONLEY YUNGBLUT, RDR, RMR, CRR, CRC DATE 19 20 21 22 23 24 25